REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and16. Claims 1 and 16 are amended herein, and new claim 18 is added. No new matter is presented. Claims 9-15 and 17 remain cancelled.

Thus, claims 1-8, 16 and 18 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1-8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,548,506 (Srinivasan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,364 (Lortz).

Independent claim 1, as amended recites, "storing information of development situations, know-how, and knowledge in a solution bank at the center in units of solution patterns, said information indicating software components of a default software system and said solution patterns having been previously provided." The invention of claim 1 maintains a record of "solution patterns" which allows subsequent selection of "a solution pattern among said solution patterns that is applicable to a customer." Independent claim 16 recites similar features.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner appears to equate the reminder follow-ups and project status reports in Srinivasan with the stored information of "development situations, know-how, and knowledge in a solution bank at the center in units of solution patterns",, as taught by the claimed invention. However, Srinivasan only discusses sending out reminder follow-ups and project status reports for current project plans where an environment configuration file is created to be used in submitting an input file for electronic mail or for faxing, and reminder frequency and default reminder window (see, col. 7, lines 13-20 and Fig. 3 including corresponding text).

Per the Examiner's assertion Srinivasan does not teach installing the default software system in the computer and constructing a desired software system based on the installed default software system. Further, as Srinivasan merely discusses planning/monitoring of project information such as project names, leader names, task names and current situations, Lortz does not cure the deficiencies of Srinivasan regarding the claimed invention.

In particular, Lortz is limited to creating a device function and software categories node for associating a new device to be added to the device tree (see, col. 6, lines 41-63). That is, Lortz fails to teach or suggest the installation and construction of a desired software system specific to the selected solution pattern using information of "previously provided solution patterns", as recited in claim 1 and 16.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 16 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Further, even assuming arguendo that <u>Lortz</u> does disclose the features discussed by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is apparent motivation to combine <u>Srinivasan</u> for tracking plans with respect to a project and <u>Lortz</u> ccreating nodes for functions and software categories of a new device for association with the device tree.

MPEP §2143.01 states that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so.

Therefore, as there is no requisite motivation to combine the references cited by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejections.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 18 is directed to "storing software development information accumulated in accordance with previously provided solution patterns [that indicates] an application environment of each of said solution patterns" and installing a component "by retrieving content applicable to the software system from said development information." At least these features are not disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 18 also patentably distinguishes over <u>Srinivasan</u> and <u>Lortz</u>.

CONCLUSION:

Accordingly, claims 1 and 16 are amended and new claim 18 is added. Claims 1-8, 16 and 18 are pending and under consideration (claims 9-15 and 17 remain cancelled).

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 19, 2007

By: /Temnit Afework/
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501